

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/614,282 Examiner Joanne Hama, Ph.D.	LEE ET AL. Art Unit 1632

All Participants:

Status of Application: _____

(1) Joanne Hama, Ph.D.

(3) _____.

(2) Ms. Jessica Roark.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 6 January 2006

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

12, 17, 23, 24, 26, 36-39

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.


It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The pending claims appeared allowable. Ms. Roark was asked if the Applicant would like to cancel withdrawn claims 36-39 and have a patent issued on claims 1-5, 12-14, 17, and 20-26. Ms. Roark was also asked if amendments could be made to the pending claims wherein the claimed methods are amended to "in vitro" methods and that the claimed cells be amended to "isolated, eukaryotic" cells. In addition to this, it was asked if claims 4 and 5 could be changed to "viral" vector. Ms. Roark approved these changes.



DAVE TRONG NGUYEN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER